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Abstract

We give a polynomial time \((3/2+\epsilon)\)-approximation algorithm for the unsplittable capacitated vehicle routing problem (CVRP) on trees. Our approximation ratio is tight, given that it is NP-hard to approximate this problem to better than a \(3/2\) factor \([GW81]\).

1 Introduction

In the unsplittable capacitated vehicle routing problem (CVRP), we are given an edge-weighted graph with a vertex called depot, a subset of vertices called terminals, each with a positive integer demand, and a positive integer tour capacity. The goal is to find a minimum length collection of tours starting from and ending at the depot that together cover the demand at every terminal, where the demand at a terminal must be covered by a single tour. Originally introduced by Dantzig and Ramser in 1959 \([DR59]\), the unsplittable CVRP generalizes the traveling salesman problem, and is arguably one of the most important problems in Operations Research.

On general metrics, the first constant-factor approximation algorithm for the unsplittable CVRP was the iterated tour partitioning (ITP), which was proposed and analyzed in the 1980s by Haimovich and Rinnooy Kan \([HR85]\) and Altinkemer and Gavish \([AG87]\). The approximation ratio for the unsplittable CVRP was only recently improved in work by Blauth, Traub, and Vygen \([BTV21]\), and then further by Friggstad et al. \([FMRS21]\), so that the best-to-date approximation ratio stands at roughly 3.194.

In this work, we study the unsplittable CVRP on trees. This special case of the problem was introduced by Labbé, Laporte and Mercure \([LLM91]\), and was motivated by river networks, some railway networks (including pit mine railway networks), as well as applications in the flexible manufacturing environment \([BBL92]\). It is NP-hard to approximate the unsplittable tree CVRP to better than a 1.5 factor \([GW81]\). On the other hand, the 2-approximation algorithm for the unsplittable tree CVRP in \([LLM91]\) has remained the best-to-date approximation for more than 30 years, thus leaving a gap between the lower bound and the upper bound of the approximation ratio. Heuristics and experimental tests for the unsplittable tree CVRP were given in \([CR08, BFW99]\).

A special case of the unsplittable tree CVRP is the unsplittable CVRP on paths, where the underlying tree is a path. This problem was first considered by Uzsoy \([Uzs94]\) under another name of “minimizing makespan on a single batch processing machine with non-identical job sizes”. Since then many heuristics for the unsplittable path CVRP have been proposed and evaluated empirically, e.g., \([DDF02, MDC04, DMS06, KKJ06, PKK10, CDH11, JL14, AS15, Mut20]\). Zhang et al. \([ZCLW01]\) stands out in its theoretical treatment of the worst case behaviour of several heuristics. That
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paper proves constant approximation ratios for some heuristics, with 1.75 being the best, while showing that other heuristics may perform arbitrarily bad \[^{\text{ZCLW01}}\]. The approximation ratio for the unsplittable path CVRP was improved to 1.7 by Dosa et al. \[^{\text{DTT}+14}\]. The best-to-date approximation ratio \[^{\text{WL20}}\] for the unsplittable path CVRP is 1.6. On the other hand, the unsplittable path CVRP generalizes the bin packing problem\[^{\text{T}}\]. Since it is NP-hard to approximate the bin packing problem to better than a 1.5 factor (e.g., \[^{\text{WS11}}\]), it is also NP-hard to approximate the the unsplittable path CVRP to better than a 1.5 factor. Again, there is a gap between the lower bound and the upper bound for the approximation ratio of the unsplittable path CVRP.

In this paper, we provide a \((3/2 + \epsilon)\)-approximation algorithm for the unsplittable CVRP on trees (Theorem 1). This closes the gap between the lower bound and the upper bound for both problems: the unsplittable CVRP on trees and the unsplittable CVRP on paths.

**Theorem 1.** For any \(\epsilon > 0\), there is a polynomial time \((3/2 + \epsilon)\)-approximation algorithm for the unsplittable capacitated vehicle routing problem (CVRP) on trees.

### 1.1 Related Work

**Restricted settings of the unsplittable path CVRP.** Das, Mathieu, and Mozes \[^{\text{DMM10}}\] studied several restricted settings of the unsplittable path CVRP, such as when the optimal value is at least \(\Omega(1/\epsilon^6)\) times the maximum distance between any terminal and the depot, and gave asymptotic polynomial time approximation schemes (APTAS) in those settings. Subsequently, those restricted settings were studied in \[^{\text{Rot12, CGH13}}\] with an improved running time. Other restricted settings of the unsplittable path CVRP were studied in \[^{\text{KKG09, ZCLW01}}\]. The algorithm in Theorem 1 is completely different, and works for the general setting of the unsplittable CVRP on paths (and even more generally on trees) without any restrictions.

**Splittable CVRP on trees.** The splittable tree CVRP is NP-hard \[^{\text{LLM91}}\]. Hamaguchi and Katoh \[^{\text{HK98}}\] gave a polynomial time 1.5-approximation for this problem. The approximation ratio was improved to 1.35078 by Asano, Katoh, and Kawashima \[^{\text{AKK01}}\] and was further reduced to 4/3 by Becker \[^{\text{Bec18}}\]. Becker and Paul \[^{\text{BP19}}\] gave a bicriteria polynomial time approximation scheme, allowing the tour capacity to be violated by an \(\epsilon\) fraction. Jayaprakash and Salavatipour \[^{\text{JS22}}\] gave a quasi-polynomial time approximation scheme (QPTAS). A polynomial time approximation scheme (PTAS) was given by Mathieu and Zhou \[^{\text{MZ21}}\], with new ideas to overcome the additional obstacles.

**Unit demand CVRP.** The CVRP has also been extensively studied in the unit demand setting. There have been polynomial time constant-factor approximation algorithms for general metrics \[^{\text{HR85, AG90, BDO06, BTV21}}\]. QPTAS algorithms have been designed for the unit demand CVRP in several metrics: Euclidean \[^{\text{DM15}}\], trees or bounded treewidth and beyond \[^{\text{JS22}}\], planar and bounded-genus graphs with fixed tour capacity \[^{\text{BKS17}}\], and minor-free graphs \[^{\text{CFKL20}}\]. When the tour capacity \(k\) is small, the unit demand CVRP admits PTAS algorithms on several metrics: Euclidean \[^{\text{HR85, AKTT97, ACL10}}\], planar graphs \[^{\text{BKS19}}\], graphs of bounded highway dimension \[^{\text{BKS18}}\], bounded genus graphs and bounded treewidth graphs \[^{\text{CFKL20}}\].

---

\[^{1}\]To reduce a bin packing instance with \(n\) items to an instance of the unsplittable path CVRP, we construct a path of \(n\) edges \(e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n\), such that the weight of \(e_1\) equals 1 and the weight of \(e_i\) equals 0 for each \(i \in [2, n]\).

\[^{2}\]The unsplittable path CVRP was called the \textit{train delivery problem} in \[^{\text{DMM10, CGH13, Rot12}}\].

\[^{3}\]A technical detail is that both \[^{\text{JS22}}\] and \[^{\text{MZ21}}\] have assumptions on the tour capacity \(k\) barring it from being exponential in \(n\).
2 Preliminaries

Let $T$ be a rooted tree $(V,E)$ with root $r \in V$ and edge weights $w(u,v) \geq 0$ for all $(u,v) \in E$. The root $r$ represents the depot of the tours. For each vertex $v \in V$, let $\text{dist}(v)$ denote the distance between $v$ and the depot. Let $V' \subseteq V$ be the set of terminals, such that each terminal $v \in V'$ has a demand $\text{demand}(v) > 0$. Up to scaling, we assume that the tour capacity is 1 and that demand$(v)$ at any terminal $v$ is in $(0,1]$.

We say that a tour visits a terminal $v \in V'$ if the tour picks up the token at $v$.

In the unsplittable capacitated vehicle routing problem (CVRP), the goal is to find a minimum length collection of tours, each starting from and ending at $r$ and visiting terminals of total demand at most 1, that together cover the demands of all terminals. Let $\text{OPT}$ (resp. $\text{OPT}_2$) denote an optimal (resp. near-optimal) solution to the unsplittable CVRP, and let $\text{opt}$ (resp. $\text{opt}_2$) denote the value of the corresponding solution.

Without loss of generality, we assume that every vertex in the tree $T$ has two children, and that the terminals are the same as the leaf vertices of the tree. Let $n = |V'|$ denote the number of terminals. The number of vertices in the tree $T$ is $2n - 1$.

For any vertex $v \in V$, a subtour at the vertex $v$ is a path that starts and ends at $v$ and only visits vertices in the subtree rooted at $v$. For any subtour $t$, the demand of $t$, denoted by $\text{demand}(t)$, is the total demand of all terminals visited by $t$. Similarly, for any subgraph $\Lambda$ of $T$, the demand of $\Lambda$, denoted by $\text{demand}(\Lambda)$, is the total demand of all terminals in $\Lambda$.

For technical reasons, we allow dummy terminals to be included in our solution at internal vertices of the tree when we round up the demands of the subtours.

3 Previous Techniques

Theorem 3, Fact 4, and Lemma 5, Lemma 6, Definition 7, and Fact 8 are already given in [MZ21] for the unit demand tree CVRP; the arguments for the unsplittable tree CVRP are identical, hence omitted here. The proof of Theorem 9 is a small adaptation of the proof in [MZ21].

3.1 Preprocessing: Reduction to Instances of Bounded Distances

Definition 2 (bounded distances). Let $D_{\min}$ (resp. $D_{\max}$) denote the minimum (resp. maximum) distance between the depot and any terminal in the tree. We say that an instance has bounded distances if $D_{\max} < (\frac{1}{2})^{\frac{1}{2}+1} \cdot D_{\min}$.

Theorem 3 ([MZ21]). For any $\rho \geq 1$, if there is a polynomial time $\rho$-approximation algorithm for the unsplittable CVRP on trees with bounded distances, then there is a polynomial time $(1 + 5\epsilon)\rho$-approximation algorithm for the unsplittable CVRP on trees with general distances.

From Theorem 3, it suffices to consider instances with bounded distances.

3.2 Decomposition into Components

We decompose the tree $T$ into components using the construction in [MZ21].
**Fact 4** ([M21]). Let $\Gamma = \frac{12}{\epsilon}$. There is a polynomial time algorithm to compute a partition of the edges of the tree $T$ into a set $C$ of components, such that all of the following properties are satisfied:

- Every component $c \in C$ is a connected subgraph of $T$; the root vertex of the component $c$, denoted by $r_c$, is the vertex in $c$ that is closest to the depot.

- We say that a component $c \in C$ is a leaf component if all descendants of $r_c$ in tree $T$ are in $c$, and is an internal component otherwise. A leaf component $c$ interacts with other components at vertex $r_c$ only. An internal component $c$ interacts with other components at two vertices only: at vertex $r_c$, and at another vertex, called the exit vertex of the component $c$, and denoted by $e_c$.

- Every component $c \in C$ contains at most $2\Gamma$ demand.

- The number of components in the tree $T$ is at most $\frac{3}{\epsilon} \cdot \text{demand}(T)/\Gamma$.

*Proof sketch.* The first three properties are identical in [M21]. It suffices to show the last property. From [M21], there exists a map from all components to components with demands at least $\Gamma$, such that each component with demand at least $\Gamma$ has at most three pre-images. There are at most $\frac{\text{demand}(T)}{\Gamma}$ components in the tree $T$ with demands at least $\Gamma$. The claim follows.

**Lemma 5** ([M21]). We have $\sum_{\text{component } c} \text{dist}(r_c) \leq \epsilon \cdot \frac{8}{\delta} \cdot \text{opt}$.

### 3.3 Transformation of the Tree

As in [M21], we transform the tree $T$ into a tree $\hat{T}$ so that $\hat{T}$ has $O(1)$ levels of components.

**Lemma 6** ([M21]). Let $\hat{D} = \alpha \cdot \epsilon \cdot D_{\text{min}}$. Let $H_\epsilon = (\frac{3}{\epsilon} + 1)$ for each $i \in [1, H_\epsilon]$, let $C_i \subseteq C$ denote the set of components $c \in C$ such that $\text{dist}(r_c) \in \left[(i - 1) \cdot \hat{D}, i \cdot \hat{D}\right)$. Then any component $c \in C$ belongs to a set $C_i$ for some $i \in [1, H_\epsilon]$.

**Definition 7** ([M21], maximally connected sets and critical vertices). We say that a set of components $\hat{C} \subseteq C$ is maximally connected if the components in $\hat{C}$ are connected to each other and $\hat{C}$ is maximal within $C_i$. For a maximally connected set of components $\hat{C} \subseteq C_i$, we define the critical vertex of $\hat{C}$ to be the root vertex of the component $c \in \hat{C}$ that is closest to the depot.

**Algorithm 1** Construction of the tree $\hat{T}$ ([M21]).

1: for each $i \in [1, H_\epsilon]$ do
2: for each maximally connected set of components $\hat{C} \subseteq C_i$ do
3: $z \leftarrow$ critical vertex of $\hat{C}$
4: for each component $c \in \hat{C}$ do
5: $\delta \leftarrow r_c$-to-$z$ distance in $T$
6: Split the tree $T$ at the root vertex $r_c$ of the component $c$
7: Add an edge between the root of the component $c$ and $z$ with weight $\delta$
8: $\hat{T} \leftarrow$ the resulting tree

Let $\hat{T}$ be the tree constructed in Algorithm 1. We observe that Algorithm 1 is in polynomial time. Fact 8 follows from the construction.

**Fact 8** ([M21]). Any solution for the unsplittable CVRP on the tree $\hat{T}$ can be transformed in polynomial time into a solution for the unsplittable CVRP on the tree $T$ without increasing the cost.
3.4 Structure of a Near-Optimal Solution

**Theorem 9** (Adaption from [MZ21]). Consider the unsplittable CVRP on the tree $\hat{T}$ with bounded distances. Let $\alpha = \epsilon^{(1/\epsilon)+1}$. There exists a solution $\text{OPT}_2$ visiting all of the real terminals plus possibly some dummy terminals, such that all of the following holds:

1. For any component $c \in C$, there are at most $2\Gamma \alpha + 1$ tours in $\text{OPT}_2$ visiting terminals in $c$;
2. For any tour $t$ in $\text{OPT}_2$ and any component $c \in C$ containing terminals visited by $t$, tour $t$ covers at least $\alpha$ demand in $c$;
3. We have $\text{opt}_2 < (1 + 3\epsilon) \cdot \text{opt}$, where $\text{opt}$ denotes the optimal cost for the unsplittable CVRP on the tree $T$.

*Proof Sketch.* Everything in [MZ21] carries over to the unsplittable setting, replacing capacity $k$ by capacity 1 everywhere, except that in the construction of a near-optimal solution, the Iterated Tour Partitioning (ITP) algorithm, which is applied on the tour $t_{\text{TSP}}$, is adapted as follows. We partition the tour $t_{\text{TSP}}$ into segments, each with demand in $[1 - \alpha, 1]$ except possibly the last segment containing less demand. This is achievable since every terminal on the tour $t_{\text{TSP}}$ has demand at most $\alpha$. Finally, for each segment, we connect its endpoints to the depot so as to make a tour. The analysis is identical except for a suitable adaptation of the analysis of the ITP algorithm.

3.5 Assignment Lemma

**Lemma 10** (Lemma 1 in [BP19]). Let $G = (A, B, E)$ be an edge-weighted bipartite graph whose partition has the parts $A$ and $B$, with $E$ denoting the edges of the graph, such that each edge $(a, b) \in E$ has a weight $w(a, b) \geq 0$. For each vertex $v \in A \cup B$, let $N(v)$ denote the set of vertices $u \in A \cup B$ such that $(u, v) \in E$. Suppose that for each vertex $b \in B$, we have $N(b) \neq \emptyset$ and that its weight $w(b) \geq 0$ satisfies that $w(b) \leq \sum_{a \in N(b)} w(a, b)$. Then there exists an assignment $f : B \rightarrow A$ such that each vertex $b \in B$ is assigned to a vertex $a \in N(b)$ and that, for each vertex $a \in A$, we have

$$\sum_{b \in B \mid f(b) = a} w(b) - \sum_{b \in N(a)} w(a, b) \leq \max_{b \in B} w(b).$$

4 Multi-Level Decomposition of a Component

To compute a solution with properties in Theorem 9, the difficulty is that we are not able to compute in polynomial time an optimal solution of subtours within a component. Indeed, unless $P = NP$, we cannot even compute in polynomial time a better-than-(3/2) approximate solution inside a component, since the problem can be reduced from the bin packing. This is in contrast to the unit demand setting where the demand of each subtour can be represented by an integer in $[1, n]$, thus an optimal solution of subtours within a component can be computed in polynomial time. In the unsplittable setting, the demands of subtours are among an exponential number of values. In this section, we partition the terminals of a component into $O(\epsilon(1))$ parts. Later in Section 5, we show that, there exists a $(3/2 + 2\epsilon)$-approximate solution such that the terminals in each part is visited by a single tour.

**Definition 11** (big and tiny terminals). We say that a terminal $v$ is **big** if $\text{demand}(v) > \epsilon \cdot \alpha / \Gamma$ and **tiny** otherwise.

Let $c$ be any component. Since $c$ has total demand at most $2\Gamma$ (Fact 4), we have:
Fact 12. Let $\mathcal{B}_c$ denote the set of big terminals in $c$. We have $|\mathcal{B}_c| = O_\epsilon(1)$.

To partition the tiny terminals, we describe a decomposition of the component $c$ into $O_\epsilon(1)$ cells. The decomposition is of three levels: blocks, clusters, and cells. We want that all terminals in a block have tiny demands, the overall demand inside a cluster is at most a small constant $O_\epsilon(1)$, and the spine of each cell is an $\epsilon$ fraction of the spine of a cluster.

Level 1: Decomposition of a Component into Blocks (Fig. 1a). We say that a vertex in component $c$ is a key vertex if it is a big terminal in $c$, the root vertex of $c$, or eventually the exit vertex of $c$ if $c$ is an internal component (see Fact 4 for definitions). Define the skeleton of the component $c$ to be the subtree spanning the key vertices. The branch vertices of this skeleton decompose the component into edge disjoint subgraphs, called blocks. Each block has a root vertex and an exit vertex, both belonging to the set of key vertices and branch vertices. Observe that a block does not contain any big terminal, except possibly at its exit vertex. We ignore the demand at the exit vertex of a block.

Note that the component $c$ is a binary tree.
**Level 2: Decomposition of a Block into Clusters (Fig. 1b).** The decomposition is the same as the component decomposition of the entire tree, except with a different parameter: we replace $\Gamma$ in Fact 4 by $\Gamma' = \epsilon \cdot \alpha / \Gamma$. Thus each cluster has demand less than $2 \epsilon \cdot \alpha / \Gamma$. A cluster is of type “passing” if it has some descendant cluster in the block or if it contains the exit vertex of the block; otherwise it is of type “ending”. Each cluster has a root vertex. Each passing cluster has an exit vertex. The path between the root vertex and the exit vertex of a passing cluster is the spine of the cluster.

**Level 3: Decomposition of a Cluster into Cells (Fig. 1c).** If the cluster is “ending”, then the decomposition consists of a single cell, which is the entire cluster; the type of the cell is “ending”. If the cluster is “passing”, then we decompose the cluster as follows. Let $\ell$ denote the length of the spine of the cluster. For each integer $i \in [1, (1/\epsilon) - 1]$, we define $e_i = (u, v)$ to be the edge on the spine of the cluster satisfying that $\min(\text{dist}(u), \text{dist}(v)) \leq i \cdot \epsilon \cdot \ell < \max(\text{dist}(u), \text{dist}(v))$. Note that $e_i$ exists and is unique. Removing the edges $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{(1/\epsilon) - 1}\}$ from the cluster results in $1/\epsilon$ connected parts; each part is called a cell. All of these $1/\epsilon$ cells are of type “passing”. The spine subtour of a cell consists of the edges (in both directions) of the cell that belong to the spine of the cluster.

**Fact 13.** Let $T_c$ denote the set of cells in component $c$. We have $|T_c| = O_\epsilon(1)$.

*Proof.* In the level 1 decomposition, the number of blocks in a component is at most 1 plus twice the number of big terminals in a component, which is $O_\epsilon(1)$. Note that the total demand of a block is at most the total demand of a component, which is at most $2 \Gamma$. In the level 2 decomposition, using Fact 4 and since the parameter $\Gamma' = \epsilon \cdot \alpha / \Gamma$, we have the number of clusters in a block is at most $3 \cdot 2 \Gamma / \Gamma' = O_\epsilon(1)$. In the level 3 decomposition, the number of cells in a cluster is $1/\epsilon$. The claim follows. $\square$

## 5 Structure Theorem

The following Theorem transforms the solution so that the terminals in each cell are visited by a single tour.

**Theorem 14 (Structure Theorem).** Let $S$ be any solution to the unsplittable tree CVRP. Let $c$ be any component. Let $S_c$ denote the part of $S$ that is within $c$. Let $n_0$ (resp. $n_1$) denote the number of spine subtours (resp. non-spine subtours) in $S_c$. Then there exists a set $S^*_c$ of subtours in component $c$ visiting all terminals in $c$, such that all of the following holds:

1. Terminals in each cell are visited by a single subtour in $S^*_c$;
2. The set $S^*_c$ consists of the following subtours:
   1. $n_0$ spine subtours;
   2. $n_1$ non-spine subtours that have a one-to-one correspondence with the non-spine subtours in $S_c$, such that for each non-spine subtour $t$ in $S_c$, its corresponding subtour $t^*$ in $S^*_c$ satisfies that $\text{demand}(t^*) \leq \text{demand}(t)$ and that if $t$ is of type “passing” in $c$, then $t^*$ is of type “passing” in $c$;
   3. an additional non-spine subtour $\bar{t}$ of demand at most 1 and of type “ending”;
3. We have $\text{cost}(S^*_c) \leq (3/2 + 2 \epsilon) \cdot \text{cost}(S_c)$.

In the rest of this section, we prove the Structure Theorem (Theorem 14).
5.1 Construction of $S^*_c$

The construction of $S^*_c$ consists of 5 steps. It builds upon the construction from previous work \cite{BP19,MZ21} in the setting of unit demand, but with several novelties: the concept of the threshold cells (Step 2 of the construction) is a main novelty in this paper, and is crucial to achieve the approximation ratio 3/2; the combination of subtours is applied both to clusters (Step 1) and to cells (Step 3) in this paper, instead of uniquely on components \cite{MZ21} or uniquely on clusters \cite{BP19}.

Let $A_0$ denote $S_c$. The construction of $S^*_c$ starts from $A_0$ and proceeds as follows.

**Step 1: Combining ending subtours within each cluster.** We define the following weighted bipartite graph $G_e$ with one part $A_0$ and the other part consisting of the clusters in $c$. For any subtour $a \in A_0$ and any cluster $x$ in $c$, there is an edge $(a, x)$ in $G_e$ if and only if $a$ contains an ending subtour in $x$; letting $t_e$ denote this ending subtour, the weight of the edge $(a, x)$ is defined to be $\text{demand}(t_e)$. For each cluster $x$, the weight of $x$ is the sum of the weights of its adjacent edges in $G_e$. We apply the Assignment Lemma (Lemma 10) to the graph $G_e$ (deprived of the vertices of degree 0), and use the resulting assignment $f_e$ to construct a set of subtours $A_1$ as follows: for each subtour $a \in A_0$, first remove all of its ending subtours in all clusters $x$, then add all ending subtours (from all subtours in $A_0$) of all clusters $x$ such that $f_e(x) = a$. Observe that each subtour in $A_1$ is connected.

**Step 2: Extending ending subtours within passing clusters.** For each passing cluster $x$ of $c$ containing an ending subtour $t_e$ of a subtour $a \in A_1$, we add to $t_e$ the spine subtour of the cell $\text{threshold}(x)$, where $\text{threshold}(x)$ is the deepest cell containing vertices of $t_e$. (Such an ending subtour is unique according to Step 1 of the construction.)

Let $A_2$ denote the resulting set of subtours. Observe that every subtour in $A_2$ that visits any terminal of a passing cell contains the entire spine subtour of that cell.

**Step 3: Combining passing subtours within each cell.** We define the following weighted bipartite graph $G_p$ with one part $A_2$ and the other part consisting of the cells in $c$. For any subtour $a \in A_2$ and any cell $s$ in $c$, there is an edge $(a, s)$ in $G_p$ if and only if $a$ contains a passing subtour in $s$; letting $t_p$ denote this ending subtour, the weight of the edge $(a, s)$ is defined to be $\text{demand}(t_p)$. For each cell $s$, the weight of $s$ is the sum of the weights of its adjacent edges in $G_p$. We apply the Assignment Lemma (Lemma 10) to the graph $G_p$ (deprived of the vertices of degree 0), and use the resulting assignment $f_p$ to construct a set of subtours $A_3$ as follows: for each subtour $a \in A_2$, first, for all cells $s$ that contains a passing subtour $t_p$ of $a$, we remove $t_p$ from $a$ except for the spine subtour of $s$; next for all cells $s$ such that $f_p(s) = a$, and for all passing subtours $t_p$ in $s$ (from all subtours in $A_2$), add $t_p$ to $a$ except for the spine subtour of $s$. Observe that each subtour in $A_3$ is connected.

**Step 4: Correction of subtour capacities.** For each subtour $t_0$ in $A_0$, let $t_3$ denote the corresponding subtour in $A_3$. As soon as the demand of $t_3$ is greater than the demand of $t_0$, we repeatedly modify $t_3$ as follows:

1. Identify a cell $s$ such that the terminals of $s$ have been assigned to $t_3$ and that these terminals are not entirely visited by $t_0$; observe that such a cell $s$ always exists.

---

8The clusters in our work are constructed differently from the clusters in \cite{BP19}: our decomposition is multi-level whereas the decomposition in \cite{BP19} is single-level, and the parameter in our decomposition is also different.
2. If \( s \) is an ending cell (which corresponds to an ending cluster), then remove from \( t_3 \) its subtour in \( s \); and if \( s \) is a passing cell, then remove from \( t_3 \) its subtour in \( s \) except for the spine subtour of \( s \).

Let \( A_4 \) denote the resulting set of subtours. Observe that each subtour in \( A_4 \) is connected. Let \( R \) denote the set of removed pieces.

**Step 5: Creation of an additional subtour.** We claim that the total demand of the pieces in \( R \) is at most 1 (Lemma 16). We cover all of the pieces in \( R \) by a single subtour from the root \( r_c \); let \( \bar{t} \) be this subtour.

Let \( S^*_c \) denote \( A_4 \cup \{ \bar{t} \} \).

### 5.2 Feasibility

The first two properties in Theorem 14 follow from the construction of \( S^*_c \). The third property in Theorem 14 follows from Fact 15 and Lemma 16.

**Fact 15.** Let \( t_0 \) denote any subtour in \( S_c \). Let \( x \) denote any cluster in \( c \). If \( t_0 \) is of type “passing” in cluster \( x \), then after each step of the construction, the corresponding subtour is of type “passing” in cluster \( x \).

**Lemma 16.** The total demand of the pieces in \( R \) is at most 1.

**Proof.** Let \( \eta \) denote \( 2\epsilon \cdot \alpha/\Gamma \). From the construction, the demand of each cluster is at most \( \eta \).

Let \( t_0 \) denote any non-spine subtour in \( A_0 \). Let \( t_1, t_2, \) and \( t_3 \) denote the corresponding subtours of \( t_0 \) in \( A_1, A_2, \) and \( A_3, \) respectively. By Lemma 10, demand(\( t_1 \)) − demand(\( t_0 \)) is at most the maximum demand of a cluster, which is at most \( \eta \). From the construction, demand(\( t_2 \)) = demand(\( t_1 \)). Again by Lemma 10, demand(\( t_3 \)) − demand(\( t_2 \)) is at most the maximum demand of a cell, which is at most \( \eta \). Therefore, demand(\( t_3 \)) − demand(\( t_0 \)) ≤ 2 \cdot \eta. Since each cell has demand at most \( \eta \), from the construction in Step 4, demand(\( t_4 \)) ≥ demand(\( t_0 \)) − \( \eta \). Thus the overall demand of the removed pieces from \( t_3 \) is demand(\( t_3 \)) − demand(\( t_4 \)) ≤ 3\eta.

Since the number of non-spine subtours \( t_0 \) in \( S_c \) is at most \( (2\Gamma/\alpha) + 1 \) by Theorem 9, the total demand of the pieces in \( R \) is at most \( 3\eta \cdot ((2\Gamma/\alpha) + 1) < 13\epsilon < 1 \), assuming \( \epsilon < 1/13 \). The claim follows.

### 5.3 Analysis on the cost of \( S^*_c \)

Compared with \( S_c \), the extra cost in \( S^*_c \) comes from Step 2 and Step 5 of the construction.

The analysis on both steps is based on the following fact.

**Fact 17.** The overall cost of the spine subtours in all of the threshold cells in the component \( c \) is at most \( \epsilon \cdot \text{cost}(S_c) \).

**Proof.** Let \( s \) be any threshold cell. From the construction, there exists a passing cluster \( x \), such that \( x \) contains \( s \) and that the cost of the spine subtour of cell \( s \) is at most an \( \epsilon \) fraction of the cost of the spine subtour of the cluster \( x \). Since \( x \) is a passing cluster, there is at least one passing subtour in \( x \) in \( S_c \). The cost of any passing subtour in \( x \) is at least the cost of the spine subtour of \( x \). Observe that there is at most one threshold cell in each cluster, and the clusters are disjoint. Summing over all threshold cells concludes the proof.

**Corollary 18.** The overall extra cost in Step 2 is at most \( \epsilon \cdot \text{cost}(S_c) \).
Next, we bound the extra cost in Step 5. Let $F$ denote the set of edges in $c$ that belong to at least two subtours in $A_2$. The next Lemma is a main novelty in the analysis.

**Lemma 19.** Any piece in $R$ is connected to the root $r_c$ of the component $c$ through edges in $F$.

**Proof.** First, consider any piece in $R$ in an ending cell $s$. From the construction, $s$ equals an ending cluster, let this cluster be $x$. According to Step 4 of the construction, terminals in $x$ are visited by at least two subtours in $S_c$. Thus the $r_x$-to-$r_c$ path is visited by at least two subtours in $S_c$, let them be $t_0$ and $t_1$. Let $t_2$ and $t_3$ be the corresponding subtours in $A_2$. Observe that the $r_x$-to-$r_c$ path is the concatenation of the spines of a set of clusters. By Fact [15] each of these spines remains on $t_2$ and $t_3$. Hence every edge on the $r_x$-to-$r_c$ path belongs to $F$. Therefore, the cell $s$ is connected to $r_c$ through edges in $F$.

Next, consider any piece in $R$ in a passing cell $s$. Let $x$ denote the passing cluster that contains $s$. Since $x$ is a passing cluster, there must be a passing subtour of $x$ in $S_c$. In addition, there must be another subtour of $x$ in $S_c$ (Otherwise terminals in $x$ are entirely visited by a single subtour throughout the construction, and thus cannot be removed in Step 4, contradiction). Consequently, the $r_x$-to-$r_c$ path belongs to two subtours in $S_c$ (and also in $A_2$ by Fact [15]), so every edge on this path belongs to $F$. If there are two passing subtours of $x$ in $S_c$, then by Fact [15] there are two passing subtours of $x$ in $A_2$, thus the edges on the spine of $x$ belong to $F$, so any removed piece in a passing cell $s$ in $x$ is connected to $r_x$ through edges in $F$, thus connected to $r_c$ through edges in $F$. In the remaining case, there is a single passing subtour of $x$ in $S_c$; let this subtour be $t_p$, and ending subtours of $x$ in $S_c$; let them be $t_1, \ldots, t_m$, for some $m \geq 1$. After Step 1 of the construction, the passing subtour $t_p$ remains unchanged, and the ending subtours $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ are combined into a single ending subtour, let $t_e$ denote the combined subtour in $A_1$. After Step 2 of the construction, the passing subtour $t_p$ remains unchanged, and the ending subtour $t_e$ is extended by including the spine subtour of the cell $threshold(x)$; let $t_e$ be the extended subtour in $A_2$. Since the cell $s$ contains a removed piece, either $s$ equals $threshold(x)$ or $s$ is a cell between $r(x)$ and $threshold(x)$. Thus the edges on the $r_x$-to-$r_c$ path and the edges on the spine of $s$ belong to both subtours $t_p$ and $t_e$, hence belong to $F$. Therefore, any removed piece of the cell $s$ is connected to $r_x$ through edges in $F$, and thus connected to $r_c$ through edges in $F$. □

**Lemma 20.** The overall extra cost in Step 5 is at most $(1/2 + \epsilon) \cdot \cost(S_c)$.

**Proof.** Let $H$ be the subgraph in $c$ that consists of the removed pieces and the edges in $F$ (for both directions). Since any removed piece in $R$ is connected to the root $r_c$ through edges in $F$ (Lemma [19]), the edges in $H$ induce an ending subtour at $r_c$ that spans all pieces in $R$.

It remains to bound the extra cost in $H$ due to the edges in $F$. From the construction, any edge in $F$ belongs to at least one of the two classes: (1) the edges in at least two subtours in $S_c$; (2) the spine subtours of all of the threshold cells in the component $c$. The extra cost in the first class is at most $\cost(S_c)/2$; the extra cost in the second class is at most $\epsilon \cdot \cost(S_c)$ by Fact [17]. Therefore, the overall extra cost is at most $(1/2 + \epsilon) \cdot \cost(S_c)$. □

The last property of Theorem [14] follows from Corollary [18] and Lemma [20]

### 6 Discretization and Adaptive Rounding

**Definition 21.** For each component $c$, let $Y_{c} \subseteq [\alpha, 1]$ denote the set consisting of the value $\alpha$ and the values $y \in (\alpha, 1]$ such that there exists a subset of the cells $\tilde{T}_{c} \subseteq T_{c}$ and a subset of the big
Proof. From Fact 12 and Fact 13, both sets
\[ \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_j\}, \] and \( j \) demands \( d_1 \in Y_{c_1}, d_2 \in Y_{c_2}, \ldots, d_j \in Y_{c_j} \), such that \( d_1 + d_2 + \cdots + d_j = y \).

Fact 22. The sets \( \{Y_c\}_c \) and the set \( Y \) satisfy the following properties:

1. For any component \( c \), the set \( Y_c \) consists of \( O_c(1) \) values;
2. The set \( Y \) consists of \( O_c(n^{1/\alpha}) \) values;
3. For any component \( c \), we have \( Y_c \subseteq Y \); and for any values \( y \in Y \) and \( y' \in Y \) such that \( y + y' \leq 1 \), we have \( y + y' \in Y \).

Proof. From Fact 12 and Fact 13, both sets \( B_c \) and \( T_c \) are of size \( O_c(1) \). Hence the first property of the claim.

The second property of the claim follows from the first property and the fact that the number of components in the tree \( \hat{T} \) is \( O(n) \).

To show the third property of the claim, first, observe that from the definition of \( Y \), we have \( Y_c \subseteq Y \). Next, consider any \( y \in Y \) and \( y' \in Y \) such that \( y + y' \leq 1 \). By definition, we may assume that \( y = \sum_{t=1}^{j} d_t \) and \( y' = \sum_{t' = 1}^{j'} d_{t'} \), where each \( d_t \) (resp. each \( d_{t'} \)) belongs to a set \( Y_c \) for some component \( c \). From the definition of \( Y_c \), each \( d_t \) (resp. each \( d_{t'} \)) is at least \( \alpha \), so \( j + j' \leq 1/\alpha \). Since \( y + y' = \sum_{t=1}^{j} d_t + \sum_{t' = 1}^{j'} d_{t'} \), the third property of the claim follows.

Theorem 23. Let \( \beta = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \epsilon^{(4/\epsilon)+1} \). There exists a solution \( S^* \) for the unsplittable CVRP on the tree \( \hat{T} \) visiting all of the real terminals plus possibly some dummy terminals, such that all of the following holds:

1. Terminals in each cell are visited by a single tour in \( S^* \);
2. For each component \( c \), the demands of the subtours in \( c \) in \( S^* \) are among values in \( Y_c \);
3. For each critical vertex \( z \), there exist \( \frac{1}{3} \) values in \( Y \) such that the demands of the subtours at the children of \( z \) in \( S^* \) are among these values;
4. We have \( \text{cost}(S^*) < (3/2 + 8\epsilon) \cdot \text{opt} \).

In the rest of the section, we prove Theorem 23.

Let \( S \) be the solution \( \text{OPT}_2 \) to the unsplittable tree CVRP, by neglecting dummy terminals in \( \text{OPT}_2 \). For each component \( c \), we follow the notations in Theorem 14 to define \( S_c, n_0, \) and \( n_1, \) and we apply Theorem 14 to obtain a set of subtours \( S_c^* \) consisting of \( n_0 \) spine subtours and \( n_1 + 1 \) non-spine subtours. By Theorem 14, for each non-spine subtour \( t \) in \( S_c \), there is a corresponding non-spine subtour \( t^* \) in \( S_c^* \) such that demand \( (t^*) \leq \text{demand}(t) \) and that if \( t \) is of type “passing” in \( c \), then \( t^* \) is of type “passing” in \( c \). If the demand of \( t^* \) is smaller than \( \alpha \), then we round up the demand of \( t^* \) to \( \alpha \) by adding a dummy terminal of demand \( \alpha - t^* \) at the vertex \( r_c \). Thus the rounded demand of \( t^* \) is \( \text{max}\{\text{demand}(t^*), \alpha\} \). Let \( t^{(0)} \) denote the subtour in \( c \) in the solution \( \text{OPT}_2 \) that corresponds to

\[ \sum_{s \in T_c} \text{demand}(s) + \sum_{v \in B_c} \text{demand}(v) = y. \]
Let $\hat{S}^*$ denote the resulting solution consisting of $S_c^*$ for all components $c$, an additional $r$-to-$r_c$ connection for all components $c$, and dummy terminals at the roots of the components. Since each tour in $OPT_2$ is within the tour capacity, from the construction of $\hat{S}^*$, each tour in $\hat{S}^*$ is within the tour capacity. By Theorem 14, the terminals in each cell are visited by a single tour in $\hat{S}^*$. Thus in any component $c$, the demand of any subtour $t^*$ in $c$ in the solution $\hat{S}^*$ equals

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{s \in \mathcal{T}_c} \text{demand}(s) + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_c} \text{demand}(v), \alpha \right\},$$

for some subset of the cells $\mathcal{T}_c \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and some subset of the big terminals $\mathcal{B}_c \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ in $c$. Thus the demand of $t^*$ belongs to the set $Y_c$.

In order to achieve the third property of the claim, we construct $S^*$ by modifying $\hat{S}^*$. To that end, we use the technique of the adaptive rounding, which has previously been used in the unit-demand setting to design a QPTAS [JS22] and a PTAS [MZ21] for the tree CVRP. The construction of $S^*$ is identical to the construction of $OPT_3$ in [MZ21], for the unit demand setting, except for a suitable adaptation of the values of the subtour demands: they are values in the set $Y$, instead of integers in $[1, n]$ in the unit demand setting. Observe that the set $Y$ is closed under addition (Property 3 of Fact [22]). Thus the construction in [MZ21] carries over to the unsplittable setting.

Let $S^*$ be the solution obtained by applying the adaptive rounding on $\hat{S}^*$. The solution $S^*$ satisfies the first three properties of the claim.

It remains to analyze the cost of $S^*$. The cost of $S^*$ consists of two parts: the cost of $\hat{S}^*$ and the cost to transform $\hat{S}^*$ into $S^*$ due to the adaptive rounding.

From the construction of $\hat{S}^*$, we have

$$\text{cost}(\hat{S}^*) \leq \sum_c \text{cost}(S_c^*) + \sum_c 2 \cdot \text{dist}(r_c).$$

By Theorem 14

$$\sum_c \text{cost}(S_c^*) \leq \sum_c (3/2 + 2\varepsilon) \cdot \text{cost}(S_c) = (3/2 + 2\varepsilon) \cdot \text{cost}(S).$$

By the definition of $S$ and using Theorem 9 we have

$$\text{cost}(S) = \text{opt}_2 \leq (1 + 3\varepsilon) \cdot \text{opt}.$$

By Lemma 9

$$\sum_c 2 \cdot \text{dist}(r_c) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \cdot \text{opt}.$$

Combining, we have

$$\text{cost}(\hat{S}^*) < (3/2 + 7\varepsilon) \cdot \text{opt}.$$

On the other hand, the analysis on the cost of the adaptive rounding is identical to [MZ21], which leads to

$$\text{cost}(S^*) \leq \frac{2}{2 - \varepsilon} \cdot \text{cost}(\hat{S}^*).$$

We conclude that $\text{cost}(S^*) < (3/2 + 8\varepsilon) \cdot \text{opt}$. 

7 Dynamic Program

In this section, we design a dynamic program for the unsplittable CVRP on the tree $\hat{T}$. We consider all feasible solutions on the tree $\hat{T}$ satisfying the properties of $S^*$ in Theorem 23, and we output the solution with minimum cost. The first three properties of Theorem 23 ensure the polynomial running time of the algorithm. The last property of Theorem 23 ensures that the cost of the output solution is at most $(3/2 + 8\epsilon)$ times the optimal cost.

7.1 Base Case: Solutions inside a Component

Definition 24. A local configuration in a component $c$ consists of the following:

- a partition of the set $T_c \cup B_c$, which consists of the cells and the big terminals in $c$, so that each part of the partition is covered by a subtour in $c$;
- an assignment of types (“passing” or “ending”) to all subtours in $c$.

Let $c$ be any component. Since $|T_c \cup B_c| = O(1)$, the number of local configurations in $c$ is $O(1)$. We enumerate all of the local configurations in $c$.

For each subtour $t$ in a local configuration, if the demand of $t$ is smaller than $\alpha$, then we round up the demand of $t$ to $\alpha$ by adding a dummy terminal of demand $\alpha - \text{demand}(t)$ at vertex $r_c$. We observe that the resulting demand $\max(\alpha, \text{demand}(t))$ is in the set $Y_c$.

Next, we compute the total cost of the subtours as follows. For each subtour, its cost is twice the cost of the subtree spanning the root of the component $c$, all terminals in the cells on that subtour, the big terminals on that subtour, and if the type of the subtour is “passing”, also the exit vertex of the component. The total cost of each subtour can be computed in polynomial time. Since the number of subtours is $O(1)$, the overall cost of the subtours in a local configuration can be computed in polynomial time.

7.2 Recursive Case: Solutions in a Subtree

The dynamic program to compute solutions in a subtree is identical to that in [MZ21] in the unit demand setting, except for a suitable adaptation of the values of the subtour demands: they are values in the set $Y$, instead of integers in $[1,n]$ in the unit demand setting. Observe that the set $Y$ is closed under addition (Property 3 of Fact 22). Thus the dynamic program in [MZ21] carries over to the unsplittable setting. Since $|Y| = O(n^{1/\alpha})$, the running time of the algorithm remains polynomial.
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